



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The nations shall learn war no more.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF PEACE BETWEEN
INDIVIDUALS, CLASSES AND NATIONS.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

SINGLE NUMBERS, TEN CENTS.

Address all communications to

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

3 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.

THE FATHERS AND PEACE.

Any one who is at all conversant with the sentiments of the fathers of our republic knows that almost without exception they had a real abhorrence of war and a strong desire that this country should not only have internal peace but peace with all the nations of the earth. The sentiments of Washington in this regard are too well known to need repetition. He had a clear conception of the dangers to liberty of large military establishments and earnestly opposed the copying by this country of the military systems of the old world. Though a successful warrior himself and believing in war when in the interests of justice and liberty, war for war's sake, for the sake of glory or national aggrandizement he utterly loathed. If he were living now, his voice would ring out like a clarion against the incipient but noisy militarism which is parading in our land to-day under the garb and banner of patriotism, and threatening, if not offset by more sensible sentiments, to involve us in many dangerous complications with other nations.

An old and distinguished citizen of Boston, whose memory goes back to the early part of this century, said to us recently that if Jefferson were still living he would be president of the American Peace Society, so strongly did he feel on the subject of peace. One can easily believe that a man who uttered and felt such sentiments as the following would have thrown himself into the present conflict for the suppression of the evil of war with all the energy of his clear head and benevolent heart: "War is a conflict in which the parties endeavor to do each other all the harm they can." "Will nations never devise a more rational umpire of differences than force? War is an instrument entirely inefficient toward redressing wrong!"

John Jay, who negotiated in 1794 the treaty with Great Britain, the first of its kind ever made, under which

three important arbitrations took place, held the same views, and taught them to his son William Jay who afterward became one of the most distinguished advocates of peace.

The pacific sentiments of these and other eminent men who assisted in founding the nation are well voiced in a speech which Daniel Webster delivered in Congress in 1823, of which the subjoined extract will be read with interest:

"Sir, this reasoning mistakes the age. The time has been, indeed, when fleets and armies and subsidies were the reliances even in the best causes. But happily for mankind there has arrived a great change in this respect. Moral causes come into consideration in proportion as the progress of knowledge is advanced; and the public opinion of the world is rapidly gaining an ascendancy over mere brutal force. It may be silenced by military power, but it cannot be conquered. It is elastic, irrepressible, inextinguishable, and invulnerable to the weapons of ordinary warfare. It is that impalpable, inextinguishable enemy of mere violence and arbitrary rule, which like Milton's angels,

'Vital in every part,
Cannot but by annihilation die.'

"Unless this be propitiated or satisfied, it is vain for power to talk either of triumph or repose. No matter what fields are desolated, what fortresses surrendered, what armies subdued, or what provinces overrun, there is one enemy that still exists to check the glory of these triumphs. It follows the conqueror back to the very scene of his ovations; it calls upon him to take notice that the world, though silent, is yet indignant; it shows him that the sceptre of victory is a barren sceptre; that it shall confer neither joy nor honor, but shall moulder to dry ashes in his grasp. In the midst of his exultation it pierces his ear with the cry of injured justice; it denounces against him the indignation of an enlightened and civilized age; it turns to bitterness the cup of his rejoicing and wounds him with the sting which belongs to the consciousness of the outraged opinion of mankind."

Back to the fathers! might well be the cry of our country just now, when a number of our citizens are restlessly putting forth every effort of which they are capable to turn our nation back into the paths of the blind and ignorant and selfish past.

WORSHIP OF THE FLAG.

There was a time when banners and flags, even those of states were unquestionably symbols of hatred, strife and war. Clans, tribes and nations going forth to conquest, to battle with their enemies, raised some emblem about which the warriors should rally and which should serve to unify and thus arouse them to the exercise of their utmost exertions. When these smaller groups of men became compacted into states, the standards of those who had conquered or absorbed the smaller or weaker groups went over to the new power with the original meaning. The long-continued use of clan and

national standards chiefly in connection with military enterprises led ultimately to the universal association of the idea of a flag with that of war and the deeds of war.

Unfortunately, much of this old idea still clings to the flags of many countries, in some measure to those of all. We met not long ago in Europe a gentleman who strongly opposed the display of national flags at the Universal Peace Congress on the ground that they were symbols of international animosity and strife. He characterized them on this account as "vile rags." Some of the friends of peace in Europe at first objected to the use of national flags, even with a white border, on the same ground, and were induced to favor it only when convinced of the possibility of converting what had hitherto been emblems of war into emblems of peace. We have often found it difficult to understand that sentimental, unthinking attachment to a flag which manifests itself in loud, noisy demonstration whenever the national emblem is spoken of. The class of people who are most addicted to it seems to indicate that it is a survival of the old feelings and sentiments growing out of the selfish and narrow and exclusive idea of nationality.

But is there no higher idea of a flag? Can not the selfish and narrow ideas and sentiments that cluster about it be made to give place to something more noble and worthy? We believe this can be done, though the change will be by no means an easy one. These national emblems can not be destroyed, even if any should wish to destroy them. They must be transformed in meaning and made instruments of unity and harmony. As they have been made the means of unifying the national life in conquest and hatred and destruction, they must be made to serve as means of unifying it in the carrying out of the deeper and nobler purposes for which nations are called into being. The time may come in the evolution of the unity of humanity when they can be dispensed with, but that time is not now. A new patriotism must be built up around them, which will kindle into enthusiasm for the new conceptions of national greatness and glory as the old did for the false and fading glory of the past.

This transformation in the meaning of the flag has already advanced somewhat in some countries. The Union Jack of Great Britain is not altogether a symbol of greed and national haughtiness. It has begun to stand also for unity and for the principles of righteousness and fairness and freedom which prevail so largely to-day among the British people. The same is true to some degree of the flags of other European countries. The stars and stripes were from the beginning an emblem of peace and unity. They are out of place in war. They first waved over a united nation built up out of jealous and contending colonies. Our flag was not merely created to express this incipient unity, but it stands more and more for unity and peace as state after

state comes into the Union and star after star is added to the cluster. It stands more and more also for each and all of those great principles of government which have made us free and strong. Not a star or stripe of it signifies opposition to other lands. It is a flag of peace. The children in the schools must be taught to regard it as a symbol of these great principles. Their infantile enthusiasm, when they lift their hands and pledge their youthful allegiance to "their flag," must be guided to an intelligent conception of the new and higher significance of this emblem of our national life. If this is not done, thoroughly and patiently, the placing of the flag on every schoolhouse, flag-day and flag-exercises will become a serious peril to the nation. There is already clear evidence that in places these exercises are awakening and strengthening in the children's minds the very ideas which ought never to be allowed to take root on American soil. We cannot afford to have our children, under pretence of patriotism, imbibe the notion that this earth exists for the United States alone, and that we ought to flaunt our flag menacingly and haughtily in the faces of all other peoples. Let the emblem be stripped of every vestige of the idea that national glory is to be acquired by aggression and bloodshed. Let it be made to stand in the minds of the children not only for liberty but also for brotherhood and helpful coöperation. Otherwise the present revival of the flag is in danger of degenerating into a selfish, sentimental, blind flag-worship whose influence over the immediate future of our national life will be anything but wholesome and elevating.

A GREATER WAR POSSIBLE.

Among the speakers at the dedication of the national military park of Chickamauga on the 18th of last month and succeeding days was General Lew Wallace. He made a strong, almost a passionate plea for fraternity between the North and the South. He went as far as any Northern man has ever gone in granting that the Southern soldiers were perfectly honest in believing that their cause was right. They died for it. "Can a man furnish better proof of his honesty? Ah, no! And instead of spitting on his grave, I would libate it with a cup mixed in equal parts of sorrow and admiration." Nothing could be more admirable than those passages of his speech referring to the friendliness of Lincoln and Grant towards the South. Speaking of the great President he used these words: "In the heat of trials which would have burned love of their fellows out of other men, he practised a patience never before exemplified but in one instance, and dealt his enemies such exceeding charity that they were none the less his friends. * * In all that time there was not an hour in which he did not recognize the Confederates, even those in arms, as his countrymen. * * In the archives of the government there are